REMARKS

The Office Action of July 10, 2008, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. No claims have been amended. Claim 29 has been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. Claims 1-27, and 30-34 remain pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 29 stands objected to for depending from previously canceled claim 28. Applicant has canceled claim 29 without disclaimer or prejudice thereby rendering the objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 13 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,925,650 to Arsenault et al. ("Arsenault"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 1 and 13 recite, *inter alia*, comparing the number of block instances with the number of available information attribute sets and based on the comparison, mapping the available information attribute sets to the number of available block instances to generate mapped block instances. The Office Action contends that Arsenault discloses such a feature at col. 2, line 1 – col. 3, line 6. More particularly, the Office Action interprets "block instances" as the segments of Arsenault and "attribute sets" as the list of keywords of Arsenault. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that such an interpretation is proper, the interpretation fails to anticipate claim 1 at least because Arsenault does not teach or suggest comparing the *number* of segments of Arsenault to the *number* of keywords of Arsenault. Indeed, no relationship exists between the *number* of segments of Arsenault and the *number* of keyword in Arsenault. Arsenault instead describes that the processor is programmed to compare each segment to the keyword to determine which segments have the keyword therein. See col. 2, line 13-17. As such, Arsenault fails to describe any significance of the number of segments or the number of keywords, let alone teaching or suggesting the feature of comparing the *number* of block instances with the *number* of available information attribute sets and based on the comparison, mapping the available information attribute sets to the number of available block

instances to generate mapped block instances as recited in claims 1 and 13. Therefore, claims 1 and 13 are distinguishable from Arsenault.

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, the memory operable to include a first queue to store active data elements and a second queue to store inactive data elements, *wherein a number of block instances is compared with a number of available data elements*. (Emphasis added). Similar to the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 13, Arsenault fails to teach or suggest such a feature. As such, claim 25 is patentably distinct from Arsenault.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-5, 10-11, 14-17, 22-23, 26-27, 29 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,768 to Lemmons et al. ("Lemmons"). Claims 6-7, 12, 18-19, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,481,011 to Lemmons ("Lemmons011"). Claims 8-9 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault in view of Lemmons011 and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,367 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis"). Claims 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault in view of Lemmons011, further view Ellis, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,906 to Finseth et al. ("Finseth"). Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault in view of Finseth. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 29 has been addressed above. Claims 2-5, 10-11, 14-17, 22-23, 26-27 and 30-31 depend from claims 1, 13 and 25, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. Lemmons fails to cure the deficiencies of Arsenault with respect to claims 1, 13 and 25. As such, even assuming, but not conceding that a combination of Arsenault and Lemmons is proper, such a combination fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 13 and 25. Therefore, claims 2-5, 10-11, 14-17, 22-23, 26-27 and 30-31 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 6-7, 12, 18-19, and 24 depend from claims 1, 13 and 25, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. The addition of Lemmons011 fails to cure the deficiencies of Arsenault with respect to claims 1, 13 and 25. As such, even assuming, but not conceding that a combination of Arsenault and Lemmons011 is proper, such a combination fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 13 and 25. Therefore, claims 6-7, 12, 18-19, and 24 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 8-9 and 20-21 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. Neither Lemmons011 nor Ellis, alone or in combination, cures the deficiencies of Arsenault with respect to claims 1 and 13. As such, even assuming, but not conceding that a combination of Arsenault, Lemmons011, and Ellis is proper, such a combination fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 13. Therefore, claims 8-9 and 20-21 are allowable.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. None of Lemmons, Ellis, nor Finseth cures the deficiencies of Arsenault with respect to claims 1 and 13. As such, even assuming, but not conceding that a combination of Arsenault, Lemmons, Ellis, and Finseth is proper, such a combination fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 32 and 33 are patentably distinct from the cited combination of references.

For example, claims 32-33 recite, *inter alia*, that the display of each block instance mapped with the same information attributes as another block instance is identical. The Office Action contends that such a feature, while not taught or suggested in Arsenault or Lemmons, is described in Finseth. More particularly, the Office Action alleges that a description of displaying program titles with the same organizational categories spatially adjacent to one another is equivalent to the recited feature of claims 32 and 33. However, when read in context, such an interpretation fails to teach or suggest said features of claims 32 and 33. Finseth merely

describes that the program titles share the same organizational category (see e.g., Finseth, col. 12, line 53 – col 13, line 42) without any description of *identical block instances*. Indeed, the program titles of Finseth are not identical (see e.g., FIG. 4 of Finseth). Stated differently, mere placement of *different* program titles with the *same* organization categories spatially adjacent to one another fails to constitute displaying each block instance mapped with the same information attributes as another block instance identically as recited in claims 32 and 33. As such, claims 32 and 33 are allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 34 depends from claim 25 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as its base claim and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited therein. The addition of Finseth fails to cure the deficiencies of Arsenault with respect to claim 25. As such, even assuming, but not conceding that a combination of Arsenault and Finseth is proper, such a combination fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34 is allowable. For example, claim 34 recites, *inter alia*, two or more block instances display identical data elements. As discussed above, the Office Action alleges that such a feature is described in Finseth. For at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 32 and 33, Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that claim 34 is allowable over the cited combination of references.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 10, 2008   By: ___/Rick H. Lin/_____

Rick H. Lin
Registration No. 61,933

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001